

REMARKS

Examiner Bonshock is again thanked for the careful consideration given the present patent application. As discussed above, the present amendments do not raise new issues for consideration, and thus should be entered. Applicants respectfully submit that entry of these amendments will be sufficient to place the case in condition for allowance. Short of allowance, the case will be in better form for appeal.

All the pending claims now specify a feature previously presently in claim 8, *vis*, “wherein the application additionally has another handle comprising different execution parameters.” The Examiner already has examined claim 8. In the last Office Action, this feature was said to be found in the King reference at paragraph 35, but applicants respectfully traverse.

The King reference is purportedly concerned with a method for enabling the selection of a picture file on a cellular telephone. Paragraph 35 of King discusses “information display areas” 510 and 512. As explained in King, these display areas could include “relevant information associated with the content of the picture files.” According to King, the information display area 510 could include, for instance, weather information location of the content of the picture file, while information display area 512 could include a banner advertisement that is relevant to the content or the location of the picture file.

This language does not reach the claimed invention. As specified in claim 8, and as now specified in other claims in the application, the claimed “carousel” includes a database with application handles, wherein the application additionally has another handle that comprises *different execution parameters*. The King reference does not appear to contain any teachings directed towards the foregoing, and certainly not at paragraph 35. The display of, for instance, weather information and an associated banner advertisement does not constitute a carousel with an application with a first handle and another handle that comprises different execution parameters. Indeed, “the carousel” is not supposed to be found in the King reference at all - - this element of the claimed invention is said to be found in the Seradom reference. The attempt to map the elements of claim 8 onto the plural displays of the King reference is inconsistent with the overall claim rejection. But in any case, King does not disclose a second application handle with different execution parameters.

The Examiner has already searched and examined claim 8, and accordingly no new issues are raised by this amendment. Applicant does not agree with the overall propriety of the rejection, as expressed in the previous Office Action response, but nonetheless the rejection of the previously pending claims is now moot. The present claim amendments are sufficient to place the case into condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned with any questions, especially if an appeal may be avoided.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 20, 2008

_____/Allen E. Hoover_____
Allen E. Hoover
Reg. No. 37,354
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Dr. - Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001